

Betty Campbell, QC Supervisor, Quality Control Section, New Mexico Department of Labor, 401 Broadway NE., Albuquerque, NM 87103, (505) 841-8435

#### New York

Charles G. Kilb, Director, Division of Audit & Compliance, NY State Department of Labor, State Office Campus, Building 12—room 261, Albany, NY 12240, (518) 457-0284

#### North Carolina

Preston L. Johnson, UI Director, Employment Security Comm. of NC, P.O. Box 25903, Raleigh, NC 27611, (919) 733-3121

#### North Dakota

Lyle Holverson, Job Service North Dakota, P.O. Box 1537, Bismarck, ND 58502, (701) 224-2825

#### Ohio

Gay M. Gilbert, Director, Unemployment Compensation Division, Bureau of Employment Services, 145 South Front Street, P.O. Box 1618, Columbus, OH 43216, (614) 466-9756

#### Oklahoma

Terry McHale, Oklahoma Employment Security Comm., Will Rogers Memorial Office Bldg., rm. 102, Oklahoma City, OK 73105, (405) 557-7206

#### Oregon

Michelle Kennedy, Communications Manager, Oregon Department of Human Resources, Employment Division, 875 Union Street NE., room 303, Salem, OR 97311, (503) 378-3216

#### Pennsylvania

Jack Rudy, Acting Director, Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, Department of Labor & Industry, 7th & Forster Streets, rm. 415, Harrisburg, PA 17121, (717) 787-3547

#### Puerto Rico

Denia Cruz de Hernandez, Assistant Secretary, Puerto Rico Dept. of Labor, and Human Resources, 505 Munoz Rivera Avenue, Hato Rey, PR 00918, (809) 754-2131

#### Rhode Island

Marvin Perry, Deputy Director, Department of Employment Security, 24 Mason Street, Providence, RI 02903, (401) 277-3648

#### South Carolina

R. Michael Baker, Deputy Exec. Dir.-UI, South Carolina Emp. Security Comm., P.O. Box 995, Columbia, SC 29202, (803) 737-2400

#### South Dakota

Dennis Angerhofer, Unemployment Insurance Division, Department of Labor, P.O. Box 4730, Aberdeen, SD 57402-4730, (605) 622-2005

#### Tennessee

Ann Ridings, QC Supervisor, TN Department of Employment Security, 10th Floor, Volunteer Plaza Bldg., 500 James Robertson

Parkway, Nashville, TN 37245-2700, (615) 741-3190

#### Texas

James Jackson, Deputy Administrator for UI, Texas Employment Commission, TEC Building, Austin, TX 78778, (512) 463-2661 or

Bert West, QC Supervisor, Texas Employment Commission, TEC Building, Austin, TX 78778, (512) 463-2394

#### Utah

Terry Burns, Director, Unemployment Insurance, Department of Employment Security, 174 Social Hall Avenue, P.O. Box 11249, Salt Lake City, UT 84147, (801) 533-2201

#### Vermont

Robert Herbst, Quality Control Chief, Dept. of Employment & Training, P.O. Box 488, Montpelier, VT 05602, (802) 229-0311

#### Virginia

F.W. Tucker, IV, Chief of Benefits, Unemployment Insurance Services, Virginia Employment Commission, P.O. Box 1358, Richmond, VA 23211, (804) 786-3032

#### Washington

Teresa Morris, Director, WA Employment Security Department, Office of Management Review, P.O. Box 9046, Olympia, WA 98507-9046, (206) 493-9435

#### West Virginia

Andrew Richardson, Commissioner, Bureau of Employment Programs, 112 California Avenue, Charleston, WV 25305, (304) 558-2629

#### Wisconsin

Chet Frederick, Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations, Quality Control Unit, P.O. Box 7905, Madison, WI 53707, (608) 266-8260

#### Wyoming

Beth Nelson, Administrator, Unemployment Insurance Administration, P.O. Box 2760, Casper, WY 82602, (307) 235-3254

[FR Doc. 93-17991 Filed 7-29-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

## LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

### Copyright Office

[Docket No. Rm 93-8]

### Duration of Copyright Term of Protection

**AGENCY:** Copyright Office; Library of Congress.

**ACTION:** Notice of Public Hearing and Notice of Inquiry

**SUMMARY:** The Copyright Office publishes this Notice to inform the public that it is preparing a report on the arguments for and against possible

amendment of the copyright law to extend the duration of copyright protection under U.S. copyright law. In order to assist in the preparation of this report, the Copyright Office is scheduling an open public hearing in order to gather input, as well as requesting the submission of written comments.

**DATES:** The public hearing will be held in room 407, James Madison Memorial Building, 101 Independence Avenue, SE., Washington, DC on September 29, 1993 beginning at 10 a.m. Those persons who wish to make oral presentations should contact Dorothy Schrader, Copyright General Counsel by telephone at (202) 707-8380 or fax (202) 707-8366, one week before the date of the hearing. Written comments by those persons who are making oral presentations at the hearing are due one week prior to the date of the hearing; other comments including reply comments are due 30 days after the date of the hearing.

**ADDRESSES:** Ten copies of written comments should be addressed, if sent by mail to: Library of Congress, Department 100, Washington, DC 20540. If delivered by hand, copies should be brought to: Office of the General Counsel, Copyright Office, room 407, James Madison Memorial Building, First and Independence Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20559.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Dorothy Schrader, General Counsel, Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20540. Telephone (202) 707-8380.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### 1. Background

The Copyright Office is conducting a study examining the term of protection for copyrighted works under U.S. law, 17 U.S.C. 300 *et. seq.* This study is conducted in light of the recent developments in Europe favoring harmonization of the terms of protection.

Section 302 of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C., specifies the copyright term of protection for works created on or after January 1, 1978, the effective date of the Act. In the case of a work created by a natural author, the term of copyright begins "from its creation" and lasts for "the life of the author and fifty years after the author's death." 17 U.S.C. 302(a). In the case of works of joint authorship, protection continues for fifty years after the death of the last surviving author, section 302(b), and for anonymous and pseudonymous works and works made for hire, the term is "seventy-five years from the year of its first publication, or a term of one hundred years from the year of its



creation, whichever expires first." Section 302(c).

The term of life of the author plus fifty years embodied in the 1976 Copyright Act marked a distinct break in tradition from the first copyright statute in 1790. Previous American copyright law had always established a specific period of protection (in the case of the 1909 Copyright Act, 28 years with a potential for a renewal period of an additional 28 years) which commenced from either publication or registration of the work. The current law, however, creates a generally broader and less specific period of protection by utilizing the date of the author's death, and commences the term of protection from the creation of the work, as opposed to its publication or registration.<sup>1</sup> The House Report to the 1976 Act described the reasons for the change:

(1) The 56 year term of protection under the 1909 Act is not long enough "to insure an author and his dependents the fair economic benefits from his works" due to increases in normal life expectancy.

(2) The growth in communications media substantially lengthened the commercial life of many works, particularly serious works whose value might not be recognized until after many years.

(3) Too short a term harms the author without a corresponding benefit to the public, since "[t]he public frequently pays the same for works in the public domain as it does for copyrighted works, and the only result is a commercial windfall to users at the author's expense."

(4) The death of the author is a more certain and discernible date than the publication of the work, and means that all of the author's works will go into the public domain at the same time, eliminating the need for keeping track of varied publishing dates.

(5) The life-plus-50 system eliminates the need for copyright renewal.

(6) The generous life-plus-50 term compensates authors for the loss of previously enjoyed common law protections, due to federal preemption of copyright.

(7) The life-plus-50 term brings the U.S. in line with the term of protection granted in most foreign countries and opens the way for U.S. adherence to the Berne Convention.

H.R. Rep. No. 1476, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 134-135 (1976).

The life-plus-50 term has served its purpose well and, indeed, was one of

the key elements which aided in eventual U.S. adherence to the Berne Convention. However, several recent international developments have once again raised the issue of whether the duration of U.S. copyright protection is too limited.

## 2. European Community Draft Directive

One significant development affecting duration of protection in the international arena has been a proposal for a Council Directive published by the Commission of the European Communities in March, 1992.

Concerned over the varying terms of protection in European countries and the barriers to trade and distortions of competition brought about by those differences, the Commission proposed a uniform standard. For natural authors, protection would last for the life of the author plus seventy years. As with current U.S. law, publication has no bearing on the term of protection for such works, since protection begins at the time of creation of the work. Joint works would likewise have the life-plus-70 term from the death of the last surviving author.

For anonymous, pseudonymous and collective works and works made for hire (described as "works considered under the legislation of a Member State to have been created by a legal person"), the Commission proposed a term of protection of seventy years from the time when "the work is lawfully made available to the public"—i.e. publication. Art. I, para. 3. Anonymous and pseudonymous works do not continue to receive protection if it is reasonable to presume that the author has been dead for seventy years. Art. I, para. 4. And for collective works which are works for hire, protection runs for seventy years from the date of its creation. Art. I, para. 6.

The Commission also proposed separate terms of protection for so-called "related rights,"<sup>2</sup> only some of which are recognized under U.S. copyright law. Thus, for performers, the duration of protection is fifty years from the publication of the fixation of the performance or, if there has been no publication of the fixation, fifty years from the first dissemination of the performance. Likewise, the rights of producers of phonograms and producers

of cinematographic works run for fifty years from first publication, or from the date of fixation if there has been no publication. And the rights of broadcasters run for fifty years from the first transmission of a broadcast.

Although the Commission's proposal is not without controversy, European Community member states agreed in Luxembourg in mid-June 1993 to adopt the life-plus-70 term by an 8 to 4 vote.

## 3. Berne Protocol

The other recent international development affecting copyright duration is the possible protocol to the Berne Convention. Article 7(1) of the Berne Convention establishes the general rule that "[t]he term of protection granted by this Convention shall be the life of the author and fifty years after his death." The life-plus-50 term of protection is a Convention *minima*—i.e. countries are free to accord greater protection than life-plus-50 if they so desire. Numerous Berne countries currently grant such greater protection (ex. Brazil and Spain for 60 years; Austria, Germany and France (musical works) for 70 years).

In a 1991 report of the First Session of the Committee of Experts on a Possible Protocol to the Berne Convention, the Committee stated that "it may be justified to consider the inclusion of a provision in the possible Protocol under which all references to the 50 years in the Berne Convention would be replaced by 70 years." Report at 30. A certain period of time, possibly 5 years, would be granted to member countries whose term of protection was shorter than life-plus-70 to enact legislation to raise their standards to the Convention minima. If this provision is included in a final protocol to which the United States should elect to adhere, the United States would be obligated to amend Chapter 3 of the Copyright Act to meet the life-plus-70 term. Although the Committee has not formerly adopted the position of life-plus-70<sup>3</sup>, there nonetheless remains the real possibility of it someday becoming the Berne Convention standard especially in light of the recent decision by the European Community.

## 4. Copyright Office Study and Public Hearing

Because of changes in the international arena and the extensive

<sup>2</sup> "Related rights" or "neighboring rights" constitute separate legal forms of protection for categories of persons who are not considered copyright authors in the traditional sense under the laws of many European countries. Examples are broadcasters, performers, and producers of phonorecords. U.S. law, which does not recognize neighboring rights, treats some of these categories as works of authorship, subject to copyright protection.

<sup>1</sup> As noted above, publication still has significance for term of protection for anonymous and pseudonymous works and works made for hire.

<sup>3</sup> In its 1992 Report from the Second Session of the Committee of Experts on a Possible Protocol to the Berne Convention, the Committee noted that there was considerable discussion and disagreement over a life-plus-70 proposal. Absent general agreement, the proposal has been postponed to future meetings of the Committee.



circulation and use of U.S. copyrighted works in foreign markets, the Copyright Office is studying the arguments for and against an expanded term of protection in our copyright laws. In order to facilitate this endeavor, the Office announces an open public hearing to address the implications of an extension to the Copyright Act's duration of protection. The Copyright Office also requests that interested parties submit formal written comments regarding extension of the duration of copyright. Such comments should address issues related to changes in foreign protection, such as the effect on marketplace competition and U.S. works in foreign markets, as well as issues related to domestic protection. In order to better facilitate discussion during the open hearing, comments from those who intend to make oral presentations at the hearing are due one week prior to the date of the hearing.

Dated: July 26, 1993.

Ralph Oman,

Register of Copyrights.

[FR Doc. 93-18187 Filed 7-29-93; 8:45 am]

Billing Code: 1410-07-F

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-338, 50-339]

### Virginia Electric and Power Company North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering issuance of an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50 appendix E to Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee), for the North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2 (NA-1&2) located in Louisa County, Virginia.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would allow temporary relief from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix E, Section IV.F.2., for the licensee at NA-1&2 to annually exercise its emergency plan. The one-time exemption would relieve the licensee from the requirement to conduct the 1993 NA-1&2 Emergency Plan partial participation exercise which is presently scheduled for August 18, 1993.

The request for exemption is based on the implementation of the licensee's emergency response capability during the April 24, 1993 Alert at NA-2. The licensee states that the implementation

of the NA-1&2 and Corporate emergency plans, along with the demonstration of the response capability, satisfy the requirements for the partial participation (small scale) exercise demonstration as specified in the North Anna Emergency Plan.

The licensee also states that this response demonstration included involvement of the cognizant State and local jurisdictions and was critiqued by the licensee and evaluated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

As the implementation of the emergency plan was demonstrated and evaluated, the licensee concludes that the adequacy of the emergency preparedness program implementation has already been demonstrated during the year 1993.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption is needed in order to reduce the duplication of the demonstration of emergency response elements. The licensee states that the conduct of the exercise is an unnecessary use of Federal, company, State and local resources that would only serve to reconfirm the established adequacy of the plan as well as the company's capability to implement the plan. Performance of the 1993 NA-1&2 Emergency Plan partial participation exercise, given the licensee's specific circumstances and performance in this area, represents an undue regulatory burden with minimal benefit to public safety.

##### Environmental Impacts on the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption does not involve any measurable environmental impacts since the exemption deals with the exercise of the licensee's emergency plan. Plant configuration and operations are not changed. The requirements for annual testing of the NA-1&2 Emergency Plan in a partial participation exercise in 1993 were essentially satisfied based on implementation of the licensee's emergency response during the April 24, 1993 alert at NA-2. Thus, the proposed exemption would not affect the probability or consequences of a potential reactor accident and would not otherwise affect radiological plant effluents. Consequently, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption only involves the action of emergency plan exercises. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents

and there are no other nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

##### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the staff has concluded that there are no measurable environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the exemption would be to require strict compliance with 10 CFR part 50, appendix E, section IV.F.2., for the licensee at NA-1&2 to annually exercise its emergency plan. The 1993 NA-1&2 Emergency Plan partial participation exercise would take place during the calendar year.

##### Alternative Use of Resources

This exemption from the scheduled partial participation exercise on August 18, 1993, would allow the licensee, State, local agencies and NRC, to reallocate the resources that are scheduled to support the exercise to other necessary functions.

##### Agencies and Persons Consulted

The staff consulted with the State of Virginia regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action.

##### Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application dated June 18, 1993, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the local public document room located at the Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of July 1993.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bart C. Buckley,

Acting Director, Project Directorate II-2,  
Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 93-18201 Filed 7-29-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M